

He was bitter in his opposition to labor unions and often used his advertising space in newspapers to publish his personal opinions of trades unionism. As editor of a newspaper that had an advertising contract with Post, I refused to publish any of his copy that had in it any of his personal opinions, or anything at all except straight advertising for the stuff he was trying to sell.

Post canceled his contract and I was glad to get him and his advertisements out of the paper.

I once told a big advertiser—a big storekeeper—this: "If you don't make money by advertising in my paper you are a fool business man for advertising in it. If you do make money, then I am under no obligation to you, and the policy of my paper is none of your business. I don't care for your advice on policy, and don't feel under any more obligation to you that I do to the poorest man in town who has a penny to buy my paper."

That was how I felt about Post and his advertising, and it is the attitude all publishers should take toward their advertisers. If Post made millions out of newspaper advertising, why should newspaper publishers feel under any obligation to him?

If he made money by advertising he got value received and was entitled to nothing else.

I say that the real obligation of a newspaper should be to its readers. There is an implied contract between a publisher of a newspaper and a reader that if the reader pays for his paper he is to get the truth. The publisher who colors the news or suppresses the truth, or distorts it so as to deceive his readers, deliberately cheats his readers—just as much as a grocer cheats his customer if he puts sand in sugar or palms off oleomargarine as fresh country butter straight from the churn.

If I were asked now what is the matter with Chicago, I would say that the worst thing the matter with Chicago is that its press is not free; that its newspapers do not give the people the truth; that they try to mould public opinion by withhold-

ing, suppressing, coloring or deliberately distorting the truth.

And the reason for this is that they are edited from the counting room—where the cash for advertising comes in. I think the people are coming to understand this—which may explain the growing distrust of newspapers by the people, and the decreasing influence of newspapers as moulders of public opinions.

There is not nearly so much influence wielded by newspaper editorials in moulding public opinion as in the earlier days of journalism in this country. Many newspapers now are moulding public opinion by manipulating the news columns.

The editors take a mental attitude of superiority, treating their readers as so many children. They sit back and decide how much of the truth THEY, in their assumed superior wisdom, think their readers should have. And the readers form their opinions on what they are led to believe are the facts.

By distorting the facts publishers are responsible for their readers forming erroneous opinions.

I have no objection to any editor having any opinion he wants to have in his editorials, if he will only give his readers the truth so they will have the same information he has on which to base THEIR opinions.

To illustrate: Hearst wants war with Mexico. He not only tries editorially to stir up a public sentiment for war, but his papers handle the news in a manner calculated to make readers see the situation from the Hearst point of view. And his papers color the news. Sometimes they print as news something that never happened.

Inflammatory headlines are printed on alleged news stories that are grossly colored to prejudice the pub-